REMARKS

Claims 1-19 and 21-39 are pending. Claim 20 is canceled. Claim 39 is new.

1. The specification was objected to for the use of "Bluetooth" without an associated trademark symbol. The specification at paragraph [0066] has been amended to associate a trademark symbol with the word "Bluetooth". As such, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the objection to the specification.

2. Claims 11 and 17 were objected to for clerical reasons. Claims 11 and 17 have been amended to correct the clerical error. As such, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the objection to the claims.

3. Claims 1-2, 6, 18-23 and 35 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicants regard as the invention. In particular, the PTO appears to object to the word "operable." Applicants have amended claims 1-2, 6, 18-19, 21-23 and 35 to remove the word "operable." Previous claim 20 was rejected based on the phrase "virtual consultant data." Previous claim 20 has been canceled. As such, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, rejection.

4. Claims 1-7, 9-13, 17-18, 21-25 and 29-38 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Campbell et al. (U.S. 6,208,974, hereinafter "Campbell"). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Present claim 1 is directed to a system including a processor, a database accessible to the processor, and storage media. The database includes a relationship table identifying a relationship of at least one pair of medical findings. The relationship table associates an alternative named field with the at least one pair of medical findings. The storage media includes instructions to direct the processor to retrieve the relationship of the at least one pair of medical findings and instructions to direct the processor to generate graphical user interface data based on the relationship and data stored within the associated alternative named field.

Present claim 21 is directed to a device including a processor, a display medium, and storage media accessible to the processor. The storage media includes instructions to direct the processor to display a graphical user interface based on at least one relationship of a pair of medical findings and a value of an alternative name field associated with the pair of medical findings.

Present claim 29 is directed to a method of providing a medical encounter graphical user interface. The method includes retrieving data associated with the relationship of at least one pair of medical findings from a database. The data includes the value of an alternative name field associated with at least one pair of medical findings. The method also includes generating graphical user interface data based on the relationship and the data. Claim 35 is directed to storage media including computer instructions for implementing a method similar to the method of claim 29.

Turning to the cited reference, Campbell is directed to wellness plan administration software that provides a user interface to enable users to learn about and select a wellness plan. (Campbell, Abstract). In one particular client server implementation, the server executes database management software and maintains the series of relational databases (tables). (Campbell, col. 4, lines 12-14). Campbell states that a rule out list is a list of possible diagnoses automatically generated by the server. The rule out list is generated from a table that keeps a list of all ailments called the "all ailments table." Each item within the all ailments table has observations potentially associated with it. The actual observation is made during the physical examination or matched against the list of observations associated with the ailments. Ailments, which match are then added to the diagnosis rule out list. (Campbell, col. 17, lines 6-14). Campbell does not disclose a relationship table identifying a relationship of at least one pair of medical findings that includes an alternative name field associated with the at least one pair of medical findings and does not teach generating graphical user interface data based on the relationship of the pair of medical findings and data stored within the associated alternative name field.

In contrast, each of the claims recites an associated alternative name field. For example, claim 1 recites "the relationship table associating an alternative name field with the at least one pair of medical findings." Claim 1 also states "generate graphical user interface data based on the relationship and data stored within the associated alternative name field." Campbell fails to teach or suggest such a feature.

For at least the foregoing reasons, claims 1-7, 9-13, 17-18, 21-25 and 29-38 are not anticipated by Campbell. As such, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. 102(b) rejection.

4. Claims 8 and 26-28 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Campbell in view of Wilkes et al. (U.S. 2004/0078231, hereinafter Wilkes). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

As noted above, Campbell fails to teach or suggest a relationship table associating an alternative name field with the at least one pair of medical findings and fails to teach or suggest generating graphical user interface data based on the relationship and data stored within the associated alternative name field. Turning to Wilkes, Wilkes is directed to a system and method for utilizing electronic clinical documentation, including nursing orders, patient treatment orders, and is directed to systems and methods for providing decision support, including clinical decision support during the treatment of a patient. (Wilkes, Abstract). While Wilkes is relied upon for other features of the claims, Wilkes fails to teach or suggest a relationship table associating an alternative name field with at least one pair of medical findings and fails to teach or suggest generating graphical user interface data based on the relationship and data stored within the associated alternative name field. As such, Wilkes fails to overcome the deficiencies of Campbell with respect to claim 1 and 21.

For the foregoing reasons, claims 8 and 26-28 are patentable over Campbell in view of Wilkes. As such, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. 103(a) rejection.

5. Claims 14-16 and 19 were rejected to under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Campbell in view of Heinze et al. (U.S. 6,915,254). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

As noted above, Campbell fails to teach or suggest a relationship table associating an alternative name field with the at least one pair of medical findings and fails to teach or suggest generating graphical user interface data based on the relationship and data stored within the associated alternative name field. Heinze is directed to a program implementation for automatically assigning medical codes to computer readable physician notes using natural language processing. (Heinze, Abstract). Heinze fails to teach or suggest a relationship table associating an alternative name field with the at least one pair of medical findings and fails to teach or suggest generating the graphical user interface data based on the relationship and data stored within the associated alternative name field. While Heinze was relied upon for other features, Heinze fails to overcome the deficiencies of Campbell with respect to claim 1.

For at least the foregoing reasons, claims 14-16 and 19 are patentable over Campbell in view of Heinze. As such, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. 103(a) rejection.

6. Claim 39 is new and includes subject matter deriving support from the originally filed application and patentable over the cited references.

Applicant(s) respectfully submit that the present application is now in condition for allowance. Accordingly, the Examiner is requested to issue a Notice of Allowance for all pending claims.

Should the Examiner deem that any further action by the Applicants would be desirable for placing this application in even better condition for issue, the Examiner is requested to telephone Applicants' undersigned representative at the number listed below.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fees which may be required, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account Number 50-3797.

Respectfully submitted,

_8./9.08_
Date

John R. Schell, Reg. No. 50,776
Agent for Applicant(s)
LARSON NEWMAN ABEL
POLANSKY & WHITE, LLP
5914 West Courtyard Drive, Suite 200
Austin, TX 78730
(512) 439-7100 (phone)
(512) 439-7199 (fax)